

020732-110.694 (7493)

Section II. (REMARKS)**Power of Attorney**

Applicants have included herewith an executed Power of Attorney form that revokes the previously filed Power of Attorney and appoints new representation with new Attorney Docket Number 020732-110.694 (7493). Further, applicants have requested a Change of Correspondence, so that all communications from the USPTO will be sent to the following contact and address:

**Tristan Fulerer
Moore & Van Allen, PLLC
P. O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709**

Amendment to Claims 28, 29, 30 and 36

Claim 28 has been amended herein to include BARC material residue in the removal composition. Support for said amendment can be found inherently in the instant application at paragraph [0001] and paragraphs [0051]-[0055].

Claim 29 has been amended to recite the different BARC materials. Support for this amendment can be found in the instant application at paragraph [0037].

Claim 30 has been amended herein to include photoresist in the removal composition. Support for said amendment can be found inherently in the instant application at paragraphs [0051]-[0055].

Claim 36 has been amended herein to include at least one implanted ion in the removal composition. Support for said amendment can be found inherently in the instant application at paragraphs [0016] and [0030].

No new matter has been added herein.

Restriction/Election

020732-110.694 (7493)

In the March 21, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner imposed a restriction requirement against claims 1-36, and required that an election be made between:

Group I: claims 1-14, drawn to a composition (product), classified in class 252, subclass 79.1; and

Group II: claims 15-36, drawn to a process, classified in class 216, subclass 83.

Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, Group II claims 15-36 drawn to a process.

The traversal is based on the fact that the rationale for restriction is in error. The Office Action states that "(1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product" (see page 2 of the March 21, 2006 Office Action).

In fact, the composition recited in claim 1 is the same as that recited in method claim 15, insofar as the specifically recited ingredients of the composition is concerned, and thus is not independent and distinct from claim 1, as is necessary under 35 U.S.C. §121 as a basis for proper restriction.

It therefore is requested that the restriction requirement be reconsidered, and that all claims 1-36 be retained in consolidated form for further examination and prosecution on the merits.

Conclusion

Claims 1-36 are now in form and condition for examination. Authorization is hereby given to charge any deficiency in applicable fees for this response to Deposit Account No. 13-4365 of Moore & Van Allen PLLC. If any additional issues remain, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (919) 286-8090 to discuss same.

Respectfully submitted,

MOORE & VAN ALLEN PLLC

Date: April 20, 2006

By:



020732-110.694 (7493)

Tristan Anne Fuierer
Registration No. 52,926
Moore & Van Allen PLLC
430 Davis Drive, Suite 500
Morrisville, NC 27560-6832
Telephone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199